

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-38 were pending in the subject application.

Claims 1 and 18 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-38 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

Applicants further appreciate the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on January 26, 2004.

Applicants further appreciate the Examiner's consideration of applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, which was filed on June 2, 2005.

A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner objected to claims 3 and 18; rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP2001099654 (hereinafter "the JP '654 reference"); rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0027121 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "the Choi et al. reference"); and identified claims 18-38 as containing allowable subject matter.

B. Applicant Initiated Interview Summary

On March 15, 2006, an applicant initiated interview was conducted. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to applicants' representative by Supervisory Examiner Lefkowitz and Examiner Schindler during the March 15, 2006 personal interview. As required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), applicants' summary of that interview is as follows:

1. Brief Description of any Exhibit Shown

No exhibit was shown or demonstrated during the March 15, 2006 interview.

2. Identification of the Claims Discussed

The Examiners and applicants' representative discussed independent claims 1 and 18 and dependent claim 3.

3. Identification of the Specific Prior Art Discussed

The Examiner and applicants' representative discussed the JP '654 reference.

4. Identification of the Proposed Amendments

Claims 1 and 3, as amended in the above listing of claims, were proposed to the Examiners during the March 15, 2006 personal interview.

5. Summary of the Arguments Presented to the Examiner

Applicants' representative presented arguments regarding the failure of the JP '654 reference to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 1 including, *inter alia*, at least a portion of one of the excitation coil and the pick-up coil being sandwiched between the soft magnetic core and the other one of the excitation coil and the pick-up coil. Supervisory Examiner Lefkowitz and Examiner Schindler agreed, during the personal interview, that the JP '654 reference fails, at least, to disclose this feature of claim 1.

With regard to the objection to claim 18, applicants' representative presented arguments asserting that original claim 18 is clear and thus, no amendment to claim 18 is required. Applicants' representative described the exemplary process illustrated FIGS. 1 and 3C-3E in view of, for example, pages 17-22 of the original specification. In particular, applicants' representative explained that the "forming a lower portion of an excitation coil at a position corresponding to the pick-up coil," "forming an upper portion of the excitation coil at a position corresponding to the lower portion of the excitation coil" and the "forming an upper portion of the pick-up coil corresponding to the lower portion of the pick-up coil" features of claim 18 involve forming one of the portions relative to the size and position of the other respective portion and so as to accommodate the respective first, second and third via holes. Supervisory Examiner Lefkowitz and Examiner Schindler agreed, during the personal interview, that the above-identified features of claim 18 are clear and thus, no amendment to claim 18 is required to overcome the objection to the claim.

Applicants' representative also stated that a verified English translation of the Choi et al. reference would be submitted to perfect the priority date of the above-identified application.

6. General Indication of Other Pertinent Matters Discussed

No other pertinent matters were discussed during the interview of March 15, 2006.

7. General Outcome of the Interview

It was agreed that proposed amended claim 1 and original claim 18 are patentable over the JP '654 reference and the Choi et al. reference. It was also agreed that proposed amended claim 3 and original claim 18 overcome the objection to those claims.

C. Perfecting Claim of Foreign Priority

On May 27, 2004, applicants filed a claim to foreign priority based on Korean Patent Application 10-2003-0034540. Attached hereto is a verified English language translation of Korean Patent Application 10-2003-0005078, which was filed in the Korean Patent Office on January 25, 2003. Therefore, applicants hereby perfect the above-identified U.S. Patent application's January 25, 2003 priority date.

D. Objection to Claims 3 and 18-38

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner objected to claims 3 and 18 because of language informalities. Specific language in claims 3 and 18 is identified as forming the basis of the objection.

As discussed during the personal interview, claim 3 is amended to recite "bars are aligned" instead of "bars have are aligned" responsive to the objection.

As agreed during the personal interview, claim 18 as originally filed is clear and thus, no amendment to the claim is required.

It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

E. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-3

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the JP '654 reference. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the JP '654 reference.

Claim 1 has been amended, as discussed during the personal interview, to more particularly recite the features of the relationship between at least a portion the excitation coil and the pick-up coil. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be at least found in original

claim 1, which also broadly reads on a structure having either the excitation coil or the pick-up coil sandwiched between the other of the excitation coil and the pick-up coil.

As discussed during the personal interview, the JP '654 reference may disclose magnetic layers 26a and 26b, exciting coils 23 and 28, sensing coils 24 and 29, and insulating layers 22, 25, 27 and 30. However, as agreed during the personal interview, no portion of the exciting coils 23 and 28 is sandwiched between the sensing coils 24 and 29 and the magnetic layers 26a and 26b and no portion of the sensing coils 24 and 29 is sandwiched between the exciting coils 23 and 28 and the magnetic layers 26a and 26b.

For at least these reasons, the JP '654 reference fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1 including, *inter alia*, a soft magnetic core, an excitation coil and a pick-up coil in which at least a portion of one of the excitation coil and the pick-up coil being sandwiched between the soft magnetic core and the other one of the excitation coil and the pick-coil. For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the JP '654 reference fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1 and all the features of claims 2 and 3, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

F. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-17

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Choi et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Choi et al. reference does not qualify as prior art against this application under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The Choi et al. reference has an effective U.S. filing date of July 30, 2003 and, as discussed above, this application has a January 25, 2003 priority date. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

G. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 18-38. For at least the reasons discussed above, applicants submit that original independent claim 18 is clear, and thus claim 18, as well as claims 19-38, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance. In addition, for at least the reasons discussed above, applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable.

H. Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: March 16, 2006



Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

Attachment:

Verified English Translation of KR-10-2003-0005078

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703.525.0978 TEL
703.525.4265 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.